REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6-16, 20 and 25-33 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 16, 20 and 25-30 were rejected. Claims 9 and 12 were amended to correct antecedent basis. Claim 20 is amended to include a feature already present in the rest of the independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite because there was no antecedent basis for "transferring." Claims 9 and 12 are amended to recite "redirecting." Claims 10 and 11 depend on claim 9 and claim 13 depends on claim 12. Support for the amendment is provided at page 23, lines 12-15. No new matter is added. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6-16, 20, 25, 26 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hu (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,322). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites,

> "if the predetermined condition does exist at one of the web servers, redirecting **by that web server** at least one browser request from that web server to another one of the web servers such that the browser requests the web page from the another one of the web servers." [Emphasis added]

Claim 1 requires that the claimed redirection is performed by the web server from which the browser request is redirected. That is, the web server from which the request is to be redirected refers the client to another web server. The same web server that performs the redirection is also the web server from which the request is redirected.

Hu neither discloses nor suggests these features. The passage cited by the office action at col. 6, lines 17-22 recites,

> "**Network request manager 102 responds to the client request** with either the results of servicing the request, or **with information which will allow client 104 to contact directly (ie., "redirection information") the content server 106 selected to service the request.** "

In Hu's method, the claimed redirection is NOT performed by the web server from which the browser request is redirected. Hu's redirecting method has the redirect module 212 directly contact the client 104 (not the web server as required by claim 1) to identify another one of the web servers.

This is also explained by Hu at col. 12, lines 45-52, which recites.

> "Assuming that the redirection criteria have been satisfied, control passes to redirect module 212 within connection module 208. As described above, **redirect module 212 responds to client 104 with whatever information is necessary** according to the particular wide-area network 108 protocol **for client 104 to contact content server G directly.** In most cases the network address of the content server 106 is all that is required. Client 104 then contacts content server G directly with the client request and receives directly whatever response is provided." [emphasis added]

Also note col. 15, lines 29-30, which states, "Redirect module 212 has no direct contact with the content servers 106 which it handles..." Because Hu's redirect module 212 has no direct contact with the content servers 106, Hu's redirect module cannot itself be one of the content servers from which a request is redirected to another content server.

Even if the redirect module is considered to be performing redirecting, there are no requests redirected from the redirect module 212 to another content server 106. The requests would be redirected from a first content server 106 to another content server 106, with the redirection performed by a module 212 other than the first contents server 106. In other words, Hu's module 212 does not redirect requests from itself, and the first web server 106 does not perform redirection. Thus, Hu fails to suggest the features of claim 1.

Hu fails to disclose or suggest "redirecting **by that web server** at least one browser request from that web server to another one of the web servers," as required by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Hu, and the rejection of claim 1 over Hu should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-14 are dependent on claim 1, and thus are not anticipated by Hu for at least the same reasons.

Claim 15 recites:

a web server capable of redirecting at least one browser request from the web server to another of the web servers, such that the browser requests the web page from the another one of the web servers, if the predetermined condition does exist at one or more of the web servers. [emphasis added]

As noted above with respect to claim 1, Hu discloses a redirect module 212 within network request module 102, where the redirect module 212 provides information to the client 104 to allow the client 104 to directly contact another content server 106, thereby to redirect the request from one of the content servers 106 to another content server 106. Redirect module 212 does not redirect requests from itself, but rather redirects requests from a first content server 106 to a second content server 106. Therefore, claim 15 is not anticipated by Hu, and the rejection of claim 15 over Hu should be withdrawn.

Claim 16 is dependent on claim 15, and thus is not anticipated by Hu for at least the same reasons.

Claims 20, 26 and 31 include similar features to those discussed above. Specifically:

Amended claim 20 recites, "redirecting by a web server a browser request from that web server to another web server..."

Claim 25 is dependent on claim 20.

Claim 26 recites, "redirecting by that web server at least one browser request from that web server to another one of the web servers..."

Claim 31 recites, "a web server capable of redirecting at least one browser request from the web server to another of the web servers..."

Thus claims 20, 25, 26 and 31 should be allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 15. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

Claims 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Hu.

Claims 27 and 29 recite, "redirecting by that web server at least one browser request from that web server to another one of the web servers..." As noted above with respect to claims 1, 6-16, 20, 25, 26, and 31, Hu does not suggest this feature. Hu discloses redirecting by a redirect module 212 at least one browser request from a first web server 106 to another one of the web

PHI\1020703.1

servers 106. Hu's module 212 does not redirect requests from itself, and the first web server 106 does not perform redirection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Assistant Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication to deposit account **04-1679**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _November 17, 2003_   ~~Steven E. Koffs~~

Steven E. Koffs, Reg. No.: 37,163
Attorney For Applicants

DUANE MORRIS LLP
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-7396
(215) 979-1250 (Telephone)
(215) 979-1020 (Fax)

PH1\1020703.1